May 10, 2000

OFFICE OF THE HEARING EXAMINER
KING COUNTY, WASHINGTON
850 Union Bank of California Building
900 Fourth Avenue
Seattle, Washington 98164
Telephone (206) 296-4660
Facsimile (206) 296-1654

REPORT AND DECISION ON APPEAL OF THRESHOLD DETERMINATION

SUBJECT: Department of Development and Environmental Services File No. **B99C3087**

KING COUNTY JET CENTER
SEPA Threshold Determination Appeal

Location: King County International Airport, 7277 Perimeter Road South

Applicant: King County Jet Center, *represented by*
James Greenfield, Attorney at Law
2600 Century Square, 1501 Fourth Avenue
Seattle, WA 98101-1688
Telephone: (206) 622-3150 Facsimile: (206) 628-7699

Appellant: The Seattle Council on Airport Affairs, *represented by*
Mike Rees, President
3213 West Wheeler Street #146
Seattle, WA 98199
Telephone: (206) 282-1109 Facsimile: (206) 282-1298

King County: Department of Development and Environmental Services, *represented by*
Fereshteh Dehkordi, Land Use Services Division
900 Oakesdale Avenue Southwest
Renton, WA 98053
Telephone: (206) 296-7173 Facsimile: (206) 296-6613

Department of Construction and Facility Management, *represented by*
Cynthia Stewart, King County International Airport Manager
Boeing Field, P.O. Box 80245
Seattle, WA 98108
Telephone: (206) 296-7380 Facsimile: (206) 296-0190

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS:

Department's Preliminary Recommendation:	Deny the appeal
Department's Final Recommendation:	Deny the appeal
Examiner's Decision:	Deny; impose conditions

PRELIMINARY MATTERS:

Appeal notice received:	February 6, 2000

EXAMINER PROCEEDINGS:

Hearing Opened:	April 25, 2000
Hearing Closed:	April 25, 2000

Participants at the public hearing and the exhibits offered and entered are listed in the attached minutes. A verbatim recording of the hearing is available in the office of the King County Hearing Examiner.

ISSUES/TOPICS ADDRESSED:

- Cumulative impacts
- Drainage
- Groundwater pollution
- Noise
- Project piecemealing

SUMMARY:

Except for noise impacts under a worst-case scenario, the SEPA threshold determination appeal is denied, with conditions of mitigation imposed.

FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS & DECISION: Having reviewed the record in this matter, the Examiner now makes and enters the following:

FINDINGS:

1. On December 28, 1999 a determination of non-significance was issued under SEPA to the King County Jet Center for the construction of an approximately 43,000 square foot new facility consisting of a 27,890 square foot two-bay aircraft hangar and an 11, 223 square foot administrative support building plus garage and storage space. The new facility is proposed to be adjacent to and north of an existing two-bay hangar containing approximately 41,500 square feet. The property is occupied by the Jet Center under a long term lease from the King County International Airport and lies near the northeast corner of the airport complex.

2. A timely appeal of the determination of non-significance was filed by the Seattle Council on Airport Affairs, represented by its president, Mike Rees. The SCAA appeal statement deals only tangentially with the proposed expansion of the King County Jet Center, focusing most of its attention on overall airport operations. KCIA is in the process of updating its 1987 Master Plan and the appeal seeks to tie environmental review of the Jet Center proposal to the overall airport planning process, specifically objecting to the issuance of new leases and permits to the Jet Center and other airport tenants during the pendency of the Master Plan update process.

3. A pre-hearing conference on this appeal was held by the King County Hearing Examiner's Office on March 8, 2000, and on March 9, 2000 a pre-hearing order was issued that sought to define the appeal issues consistent with the jurisdictional basis for this proceeding. To that end, the appeal issues were defined substantively as including surface water drainage impacts to downstream resources, groundwater impacts from disturbance of potentially contaminated soils, air pollution and noise impacts, and structural impacts to the historic Georgetown steam plant lying near the northwest corner of the airport. In addition, the cumulative impacts of the proposal in combination with those of other airport activities were designated an issue with respect to the above-enumerated substantive areas. Finally, a procedural issue was identified as to whether the Jet Center proposal is so closely related to the current process of updating the airport Master Plan that the two proposals should be regarded as a single course of action requiring evaluation within the same environmental document. An issue originally identified within the pre-hearing order relating to impacts to the integrity and function of adopted land use plans was subsequently dismissed from the appeal for a lack of specificity.

4. Two of the general objections raised by the Appellant to the Jet Center environmental review process can be evaluated summarily. First, a substantial amount of the Appellant's appeal effort went into critiquing the environmental checklist filed for this application and noting its potential omissions and defects. While a checklist critique may bear on the question of whether certain types of impacts were actually considered within the environmental review, a checklist error is not in its itself affirmative proof of the existence of an adverse impact.

   Second, the Appellant has correctly pointed out that the Jet Center's lease with the airport grants broad permission to engage in a wide range of aviation activities, including not only hangaring aircraft and maintaining them, but aircraft sales and charters, air cargo and fueling operations. The Jet Center's 1990 lease appears to be a generic airport lease document and does not in itself supply meaningful limitations on the scope of the proposal. The proposal is therefore primarily defined within the Jet Center's application documents and by the uses for which its proposed facilities are suitable. The liberality of the lease only comes into consideration in areas where the proposal itself is vague and capable of encompassing multiple potential uses. In such instance, the lack of effective limitations on the proposal may warrant a worst-case scenario analysis.

5. The potential environmental impacts of the Jet Center proposal can be classified into three types: the direct impacts of construction and operation of the new facility on the leasehold site and its immediate environs; the cumulative contribution of this proposal along with other flight operations on adverse impacts to nearby residential neighborhoods, in particular the Georgetown community lying north of the airport; and the adverse procedural effects resulting from an alleged piecemealing of environmental review regarding the Jet Center proposal and other contemporaneous airport development projects.

6. The on-site impacts resulting from facility construction, as alleged by the Appellant, relate primarily to surface water drainage and groundwater issues. Drainage from this site flows west into a portion of the airport's overall conveyance system and is discharged to the Duwamish River. There is no evidence, however, that the new Jet Center facility will increase the level of drainage impacts from this property; rather there is a basis to believe that such impacts may indeed decrease from current levels.

7. The leasehold site is presently covered entirely with impervious surfaces, and the location where the new hangar facility will be constructed is now a tarmac. Construction of the new facility will eliminate from vehicular use a substantial quantity of the existing tarmac and replace it with a building rooftop. In addition, reconfiguration of the parking area will require the installation of a landscaping strip where no such amenity now exists. Finally, under the 1998 Surface Water Drainage Manual drainage flows from the site will be collected, treated and detained within two water quality vaults before being piped to an oil/water separator. The outlet will be equipped with an emergency shut-off valve that will allow the vaults to collect up to 15,000 gallons of fuels or solvents in the case of accidental spillage. Because the surface of the parcel is already 100% impervious, construction of the new facilities will not result in any increase in run-off volumes or flow rates. In short, after development of the new facility, there will be no net increase in adverse surface water volumetric impacts and a probable improvement in the quality of surface water leaving the site. With respect to downstream conveyance system capacity, the fact that some system manholes are projected to overtop during a 100-year storm event is not considered unacceptable so long as no critical facilities will be flooded.

8. All aircraft wash-down operations at the Jet Center facility will be required to be performed inside the enclosed hangar area. The floor of the hangar will be constructed with trench drains to collect wash water and convey it to the Metro sewer system. Thus, no contaminants from wash water will be discharged to the Duwamish River.

9. The Appellant has also alleged that excavation for footings and utility installation at the new Jet Center facility may result in groundwater pollution, based on the hypothesis that contaminated soils may lie beneath the site and their exposure and disturbance could release pollutants to the groundwater table. From the documents submitted by the Appellant, it is clear that soils contamination is a serious issue at other airport locations. In particular, there is a fire practice facility located some 200 feet east of the Georgetown steam plant that appears to have been contaminated with aircraft fuel and possibly PCB's.

   In addition, in 1997 a study based primarily on documentary resources was performed for the entire airport in which potential locations for soils contamination were identified and to some degree analyzed. Within this study the Jet Center leasehold was classified as "unknown" as to the likelihood of contaminated soils existing onsite, and the potential for contamination rated "likely" if contaminated soils were to be disturbed for anticipated site development. The "unknown" rating was conferred on the basis that no documented contamination existed on the site, nor was it adjacent to a location of documented contamination or inherently suspect based on recent use patterns. While no detailed history of the Jet Center leasehold parcel was submitted to the record, the 1987 Master Plan identified the site as then the location of rather antiquated T-hangars. This information implies that aircraft fueling and maintenance activities probably occurred on this site over a long period of time and supports an inference that

occasional fuel and solvent spillages could have occurred.

10. The Applicant recently contracted for a geotechnical study on the site consisting of a single boring to a 100-foot depth. The purpose of the boring was to obtain soils information relevant to liquefaction under seismic loading. While no contamination tests were performed, the general testimony of the Applicant was that no contaminant issues were noticed. Even so, given the history at the airport of soils contamination, at least a single representative test of soils within the proposed hangar footprint for the presence of hydrocarbons and other typical contaminants is warranted.

11. In the absence of evidence that development of the Jet Center facility will result in a measurable increase in direct environmental impacts, issues of cumulative impacts with respect thereto are not reached. For review or mitigation to be authorized under SEPA on the basis of a contribution to cumulative impacts, the level of the site's contribution to the impact total must measurably increase over the pre-development state. In the present case, no such quantifiable increase has been demonstrated, and questions of cumulative impacts in the areas of drainage and groundwater do not arise.

12. The primary concern of the Appellant Seattle Council on Airport Affairs, as well as its constituent members residing in the Georgetown area, is focused on the Jet Center's potential for increasing the cumulative impacts on the Georgetown community resulting from an expansion of or change of composition in the flight operations conducted at King County International Airport. Analysis of these issues presents at least two conceptual difficulties. First, any projected increase in adverse impacts from airport operations attributable to the Jet Center facility is derived within the land use context from providing a measurable increase in KCIA's capacity for supporting flight operations. Thus, in order to quantify these impacts, certain assumptions must be made about the nature and frequency of the flight operations being facilitated. Second, direct regulation of aircraft flight operations falls within the exclusive jurisdiction of the Federal Aviation Administration. Neither King County generally nor KCIA specifically possess the legal authority to limit flight operations. Local authority is restricted to the reasonable regulation of land use activities incidental to these flight operations.

13. The stated intent of the King County Jet Center in constructing its proposed new hangar facility is to provide services to the corporate jet market. The data in the record shows that this is a credible market strategy based on recent studies of airport demand. A draft business plan generated by KCIA dated June 7, 1999 identifies a lack of existing airport facilities adequate to meet forecasted "unconstrained" demand in all relevant sectors of airport operations, including accommodation of business jets. A more detailed analysis of airport "unconstrained" demand contained within a Master Plan update working paper issued in September, 1999 shows business jet activity recorded at an annual level of 31,131 operations for 1997 and projected to increase to 42,451 in 2005 and 56,141 in 2015. The only other airport activity that shows a comparable magnitude of unconstrained demand increase is in the air cargo category. The working paper also documents the existence of a current waiting list for hangar facilities at the airport. The working paper figures are generally consistent with those employed in the airport's FAR Part 150 Noise Study Draft Working Paper No. 2 issued in January, 2000. This preliminary study documents KCIA business jet use at 28,039 flight operations during the period from December, 1998 through November, 1999, with such operations projected to increase to 43,232 by 2006.

14. After new facility development, the King County Jet Center will be able to provide hangar space

for 4 corporate jets, which is twice the onsite hangar space currently available. Both the

Applicant and the Airport Manager estimate that corporate jets housed at the Jet Center facility will be used an average of twice a week, which translates into 4 weekly flight operations. Taking a more conservative position for purposes of estimating day/night noise level (DNL) impacts, the Applicant's noise consultant, Michael Yantis, estimated that each of 2 newly housed jets at the site would be used once a day for a total of 4 flight operations per day and 28 operations per week.

15. Besides frequency of use, the other major variable in estimating impacts from increased corporate jet operations is the type of jet employed. It is clear that there is a radical difference in the level of impacts generated by the older Stage II corporate jets as opposed to the newer Stage III models. The FAR Part 150 working paper contains the following observations concerning the fleet mix between Stage II and Stage III business jets:

> "The mix of corporate jet aircraft is an important consideration. There are a wide variety of corporate jets that operate at King County International Airport and these aircraft generate a wide range of noise….
>
> "The airport has an average level of Stage II corporate jet aircraft. Stage II refers to the FAA's Federal Aircraft Regulation 36 that categorizes jet aircraft based upon noise level. Stage II refers to the older, louder aircraft. Stage III refers to the newer generation, quieter aircraft. It is estimated that 11% of the total corporate jet fleet which operates out of King County International Airport are Stage II aircraft."

16. The Applicant's proposal description (Exhibit No. 28) states that "the new hangar would allow storage of two Gulfstream G-V type corporate aircraft" and that "the new hangar is being built to house new Gulfstream class corporate jets." But as the Appellant has pointed out, the new hangar will be equally capable of housing Stage II jets, and the Applicant has not made an unequivocal commitment to exclude them as tenants.

The Appellant also argues that the Jet Center site could be used to accommodate Stage II cargo jets, but while theoretically possible, this does not seem to be realistic hypothesis. The most common cargo jet is the Boeing 737, an aircraft that is too large to fit into the proposed hangar and the accommodation of which would require the installation of additional fire suppression equipment within the hangar. Moreover, large cargo jets could not be parked on the apron in front of the hangar without making them inaccessible.

17. In order to evaluate cumulative operational impacts from the Jet Center facilities resulting from an increase in business jet storage capacity, it is necessary to employ a reasonable worst-case scenario. In the absence of applicable limitations within the proposal, the worst-case scenario adopted is that each hangar bay will be occupied by a Stage II jet that will be subject to 2 flight operations per day.

18. Evaluation of noise impacts is necessarily an inexact science because the ultimate question is how individual human beings will react to different noise environments. After years of debate over assessing the noise impacts of airport operations, the FAA has developed a preference for the DNL cumulative impact metric, which is described in the Part 150 working paper as "a 24-hour, time-weighted energy average noise level based on the A-weighted decibel." This means

that disparate noise events are averaged into a single index figure based on their sound energy,

which figure is adjusted to reflect the sensitivity of the human ear to certain types of noises and a penalty for night time noise. Although still subject to ongoing discussion, Federal agencies have gravitated toward the view that 65 DNL is the threshold above which noise impacts to residential land uses become of serious concern. This generally conforms to the upper range for normal conversational speech, with noise levels above 65 dBa generally regarded as causing speech interference. The decibel measurement system does not represent a simple arithmetic progression; thus a 10 dB sound increase represents a 10-fold increase in acoustic energy and is perceived by the human ear as a doubling of sound level. An increase in sound level from 70 to 90 dBa, therefore, represents a 100-fold increase in sound energy and a 4-fold increase in perceived loudness.

19. The residential portions of the Georgetown neighborhood lie northwest of the northern end of the KCIA runways at a distance ranging from 2,000 to 7,000 feet. The 1999 base contour map within the Part 150 Study working paper shows the closest part of the residential neighborhood to fall mostly within the 65 DNL contour, with a portion lying directly north of the runway extending into the 70 DNL contour. A second part of the neighborhood lies further to the northwest, and it falls largely within the 60 DNL contour, with its eastern end extending into the 65 DNL contour.

Projected noise contours for 2006 were modeled within the Part 150 Study work paper based on an increase in total annual airport operations to 425,557. The 2006 model shows a further northwesterly expansion of the DNL contour spikes so that approximately one-half of the nearest Georgetown residential neighborhood is predicted to fall within the 70 DNL contour, and the second neighborhood further to the northwest splits nearly evenly between the 65 and 60 DNL contours.

20. Mr. Yantis, the Applicant's noise consultant, testified to performing calculations to determine the effect on the 24-hour DNL that would result from 4 additional jet flight operations per day originating at the Jet Center's new hangar facility. For purposes of this exercise, he assumed that the entire current 24-hour DNL for the airport is produced by jet aircraft based on an average daily rate of 156 jet operations. Extrapolating from this data, he assigned an average value to the 4 new operations added by the Jet Center. His calculation was that the 4 new operations would add 0.11 dB to the existing DNL. If one accepts the FAA's criterion that a 1.5 dB increase in DNL levels is the minimum necessary to warrant further analysis of impacts, then using the average noise coefficient derived by Mr. Yantis, 64 new flights per day would be required to produce a 1.5 dB change.

21. The example provided by Mr. Yantis differs from the worst-case scenario described above in Finding No. 17 only in the respect that the noise generated by the existing 156 daily jet operations universe is composed of a mixture of both Stage II and Stage III aircraft, with the latter likely predominating. It is clear that if the 4 new daily flight operations attributable to the expanded Jet Center facility were all comprised of Stage II aircraft, the net increase in DNL for the airport as whole would be somewhat greater than the 0.11 dB reported by Mr. Yantis. Nonetheless, the gap between 0.11 dB and the 1.5 dB figure generally regarded as the minimum for concern is sufficiently great as to preclude a reasonable inference that the DNL increase resulting from 4 Stage II aircraft flights would approach or exceed the 1.5 dB criterion.

22. Single event metrics are commonly regarded as less reliable than cumulative averages in describing an overall noise environment. But when single event occurrences are extremely loud, they can become the driving force behind a community's response to noise impacts. The Part 150 Study working paper acknowledges that "the human ear is a far better detector of relative differences in sound levels than absolute values of levels", indicating that abrupt increases in sound levels are likely to be clearly perceived. Experimental data indicate that at a 75 dBa interior noise level sleep interference will be reported in about a third of the study group. Also, the Part 150 Study working paper acknowledges that at the upper end of the noise scale physiological responses occur in terms of pulse rate and blood pressure changes. The report notes that, in general, "physiological responses are a reaction to loud, short term noise such as a rifle shot or a very loud jet overflight."

    Although the data has not been systematically analyzed, an increase in single event loud noise occurrences from airport operations appears to underlie the dramatic increase in complaints from the Georgetown community received by KCIA within the last 10 years. This fact was recognized in November, 1995 within Motion 9709 of the King County Council, wherein a substantial increase in residential night-time noise complaints was attributed to a sudden infusion of Alaska Airline Stage II cargo flights into the fleet operations mix.

23. The most commonly used single event metric is the dBa measure with its frequency rating component. The maximum noise level (L-max) measures the highest noise level reached during a noise event, and the sound exposure level (SEL) takes into account both the maximum noise level of an event and its duration. The SEL value integrates all the acoustical energy contained within a single event; for aircraft fly-overs it typically registers about 10 dBa higher than the L-max measurement.

24. A sense of the worst-case analysis scenario for single event flight operations originating at the new Jet Center facility can be derived by comparing the noise contours within the Part 150 Study paper for a Gulfstream G-IV Stage III corporate jet with those for the Stage II Gulfstream G-II. The north departure contour for the G-IV shows that part of the Georgetown residential community would be exposed to an SEL 90 reading, with the majority at SEL 85 or below. This means that the L-max for this flight operation would be approximately dBa 80, which, according to Figure C.2 within the Part 150 Study work paper, lies at the upper end of the "moderately loud" range.

25. By comparison, the north departure contour for the similarly sized Gulfstream G-II business jet places about half of the Georgetown residential neighborhood in the SEL 105 exposure range, with the remainder subject to an SEL 100 impact. According to Figure C-2, this sound profile falls into the "very loud" category, with the resultant noise being perceived as more then twice as loud as the Stage III aircraft. Because the noise contour from the Stage II Gulfstream G-II business jet has such a high SEL index, and recognizing that the Georgetown residential neighborhood is so near to the airport and its northern departure flight pattern, under the worst-case scenario the single event impacts of additional Stage II northern departures would be significant and adverse.

26. Finally, we turn to the Appellant's broad procedural allegation that the King County Jet Center should be grouped with the adjacent NE-T hangar and Classic Helicopters projects, as well as

every other change in the mix of uses at the airport currently proposed or contemplated, for environmental analysis within a single EIS. The procedures for determining when a group of potential development actions need to be considered as a unified proposal are set forth at WAC 197-11-060(3). Subsection 3(b) of 060 provides that "proposals or parts of proposals that are related to each other closely enough to be, in effect, a single course of action shall be evaluated in the same environmental document." The subsection states that proposals are closely related if they:

> "(i) cannot or will not proceed unless the other proposals (or parts of proposals) are implemented simultaneously with them; or
>
> (ii) are independent parts of a larger proposal and depend on the larger proposal as their justification or for their implementation"

27. The record does not demonstrate that the Jet Center proposal falls within either of the above-quoted standards. With respect to the first standard, there is no evidence whatever that the Jet Center hangar proposal is contingent upon the implementation of other private proposals or identified public proposals within the airport, such as the main runway extension. With respect to the proposed runway extension, it is uncontested that such action relates directly to the needs of Boeing military aircraft and is unnecessary for the continued operation of corporate jet aircraft of the type that will use the Jet Center facility.

28. An allegation that the Jet Center is an interdependent part of a larger proposal and depends on such proposal for its justification or implementation only makes sense if the Jet Center use is in conflict with the currently existing 1987 airport Master Plan and can only be supported and authorized if the proposed Master Plan update currently under review is adopted. This is not, however, the case. Even a casual reading of the 1987 Master Plan indicates that demand at the airport for increased business jet hangaring facilities had been clearly identified. Moreover, a complex of older T-hangars located in the northeast corner of the KCIA property was indicated as due for replacement, and a mixture of new T-hangars and larger corporate jet hangars was specified as appropriate replacement facilities. Approval and construction of the business jet hangars proposed by the King County Jet Center at its northeast airport leasehold location are contemplated by and consistent with the 1987 Master Plan.

29. While we can sympathize with the Appellant's concern that the Master Plan update process and its attendant environmental review may either be too narrow in scope or drag on indefinitely, no leverage under SEPA can be obtained to affect or influence the update process via a challenge to a private tenant project unless such project is linked to the update approval for its justification. Such linkage has not been demonstrated in the instant case. Absent a causal connection between authorization of the proposed Jet Center use and approval of the Master Plan update, no legal basis exists under SEPA for holding the Jet Center proposal hostage to completion of the update process. If the Appellant believes that SEPA review for the update will be deficient, its remedy is to challenge directly the legal adequacy of the update EIS.

CONCLUSIONS:

1. The basic standard to be applied to the review of a threshold determination appeal is that the SEPA record must demonstrate the actual consideration of relevant environmental impacts. With respect to those relevant impacts shown to be actually considered, the decision of the SEPA official is entitled to substantial weight on review and shall not be overturned unless clearly erroneous based on the record as a whole.

2. In conjunction with the SEPA statute and regulations, KCC 20.24.080.B confers upon the Hearing Examiner broad authority to impose such conditions, modifications and restrictions on the appeal decision as may be required to make it compatible with the environment and carry out applicable statutes, regulations, codes, plans and policies. This authority supplements the SEPA appeal standards and allows specific conditions of mitigation to be imposed or modified, independent of whether the determination of non-significance is found to be clearly erroneous.

3. The SEPA record supports an inference that the Department of Development and Environmental Services actually considered the potential direct environmental impacts of this proposal at the Jet Center leasehold site. There is no evidence in the record, however, supporting a conclusion that DDES actually considered the cumulative impacts of the proposal resulting from an increased capacity at the airport for flight operations. Therefore, the decision of the SEPA official regarding these cumulative impacts is not entitled to substantial weight on review.

4. The record demonstrates a reasonable probability that adverse direct environmental impacts will result from the Jet Center proposal with regard to the potential for groundwater pollution from disturbance of previously contaminated soils and that project impacts will be significant and adverse with respect to single event noise effects under the worst-case scenario involving occupancy of the leasehold premises by Stage II jet aircraft. Based on these impacts, conditions of mitigation have been added to the DNS to convert it to a Mitigated Determination of Non-significance.

5. If the conditions of mitigation are modified in the manner provided below, the decision of the SEPA official is not clearly erroneous, is supported by the evidence of record and assures that there is no probability of significant adverse environmental impacts.

DECISION:

The appeal of the Seattle Council on Airport Affairs is GRANTED provisionally with respect to the significant adverse single event noise impacts of the proposal under the worst case scenario, and DENIED in all other respects; provided that, the following conditions are imposed under authority of SEPA to mitigate the adverse environmental impacts of the King County Jet Center proposal.

ORDER:

This order constitutes the final King County Mitigated Determination of Non-significance regarding the commercial building permit application for the King County Jet Center.

Mitigation under SEPA for this proposal includes the following conditions:

1. The Application shall test on-site soils for contamination by hydrocarbons and chlorinated solvents near the western edge of the proposed hangar facility footprint, as approved by DDES.

2. Unless it modifies its proposal in writing to preclude their occupancy of the premises, the Applicant shall perform a limited scope EIS based on the worst-case scenario described in Finding No. 17, above, for the single event noise impacts from Stage II jet aircraft capable of being housed in the new hangar facility.

ORDERED this 10th day of May, 2000.

_____
Stafford L. Smith
King County Hearing Examiner

TRANSMITTED this 10th day of May , 2000, to the following parties and interested persons:

Andrew Borges
1201 - 1st Ave. S. #310
Seattle WA 98101

Christopher Chinn
Georgetown CP & Comm. Council
PO Box 7923
Seattle WA 98195-7923

Lorna Dove
PO Box 80021
Seattle WA 98108

Tom Goeltz
Davis Wright Tremaine
1501 Fourth Avenue #2600
Seattle WA 98101

James A. Greenfield
Davis Wright Tremaine
1501 Fourth Avenue #2600
Seattle WA 98101-1688

John Hooper
1301 - 5th Ave. #3200
Seattle WA 98101

Byung Chul Kang
21404 - 32nd Pl. W.
Brier WA 98036

William J. Keithan
Seattle Council on Airport Affairs
3213 W. Wheeler St. PMB #146
Seattle WA 98199

Marvin McCoy
705 - 2nd Ave. #400
Seattle WA 98104

Brandy Meyer
PO Box 235
Renton WA 98057

Jose Montano
3213 W. Wheeler St. #136
Seattle WA 98199

Mike Rees
Seattle Council on Airport Affairs
3213 W. Wheeler Street
Seattle WA 98199

John Rundall
1008 Western Ave. #301
Seattle WA 98104

City of Seattle
Office of Long Range Planning
600 - 4th Avenue, #300
Seattle WA 98104

Lilly Tellefson
6511 Ellis Ave. S.
Seattle WA 98108

Howard Trott
517 - 6th St. S.
Kirkland WA

Michael R. Yantis
1809 - 7th Ave. #1609
Seattle WA 98101
MS OAK-DE-0100

Greg Borba
DDES/LUSD
Site Plan Review Section

Michael Colmant
King County Airport

Fereshteh Dehkordi
DDES/LUSD

Cynthia Stewart
King County Airport

MINUTES OF THE APRIL 25, 2000 PUBLIC HEARING ON DEPARTMENT OF DEVELOPMENT AND ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES FILE NO. B99C3087 – KING COUNTY JET CENTER:

Stafford L. Smith was the Hearing Examiner in this matter. Participating in the hearing and representing the Department was Fereshteh Dehkordi and, from the King County Airport, Cynthia Stewart. Participating in the hearing and representing the Applicant were James Greenfield and Tom Goeltz. Participating in the hearing and representing the Appellant was Mike Rees. Other participants in this hearing were Christopher Chinn, Lilly Tellefson, Andrew Borges, John Rundall, Howard Trott, Michael Yantis and John Hopper.

The following exhibits were offered and entered into the record by the Department on April 25, 2000:

Exhibit No. 1 DDES staff report to the Hearing Examiner, dated April 25, 2000
Exhibit No. 2 Determination of Nonsignificance (DNS), issued November 16, 1999
Exhibit No. 3 Determination of Nonsignificance (DNS), re-issued December 28, 1999
Exhibit No. 4 Environmental Checklist, dated July 29, 1999
Exhibit No. 5 Appeal of DNS received January 10, 2000
Exhibit No. 6 Statement of the appeal received January 21, 2000
Exhibit No. 7 Site Plans
Exhibit No. 8 SEPA file
Exhibit No. 9 GIS vicinity map
Exhibit No. 10 Geotechnical Report by GeoEngineers dated August 23, 1999
Exhibit No. 11 Supplemental Geotechnical Report by GeoEngineers dated January 14, 2000
Exhibit No. 12 Surface Water Technical Information Report dated August 26, 1999 by SVR Design Company

The following exhibits were offered and entered into the record by the Appellant on April 25, 2000:

Exhibit No. 13 Manual of references, excluding references B23 and B25
Exhibit No. 14 Summary of Appellant's drainage testimony
Exhibit No. 15 Summary of Appellant's groundwater testimony
Exhibit No. 16 Summary of Appellant's air pollution testimony
Exhibit No. 17 Summary of Appellant's noise pollution testimony
Exhibit No. 18 Written statement submitted by Christopher Chinn
Exhibit No. 19 Summary of Appellant's steam plant testimony
Exhibit No. 20 Packet of documents related to Georgetown Steam Plant
Exhibit No. 21 Summary of Appellant's cumulative impacts testimony
Exhibit No. 22 Item A-2, with project site annotations, from Exhibit No. 13
Exhibit No. 23 Summary of Appellant's piecemealing testimony

The following exhibits were offered and entered into the record by the Applicant on April 25, 2000:

Exhibit No. 24 Resume of Andrew Borges
Exhibit No. 25 Sketch of King County Jet Center North (overview of airport)
Exhibit No. 26 Sketch of King County Jet Center North (current site condition)
Exhibit No. 27 Sketch of King County Jet Center North (proposed site condition)
Exhibit No. 28 Project description
Exhibit No. 29 Deleted (duplicates Exhibit No. 7)
Exhibit No. 30 Gulfstream and FAA-ICOS engine emissions data
Exhibit No. 31 Large, colored display map of airport
Exhibit No. 32 Master plan excerpt
Exhibit No. 33 Copy of King County Motion 7029
Exhibit No. 34 Classic Helicopter project environmental checklist
Exhibit No. 35 Affidavit regarding Georgetown litigation from Cynthia Stewart
Exhibit No. 36 Resume of Michael Yantis
Exhibit No. 37 Noise certificate